

The Washington Times.

SUNDAY, AUGUST 11, 1901.

Publication Office.

THE HUTCHINS BUILDING.

PENNsylvania AVENUE.

Subscription by Mail—One Year:

MORNING, EVENING, AND SUNDAY \$6.00.

MORNING AND SUNDAY \$4.00.

EVENING AND SUNDAY \$3.00.

SUNDAY ONLY \$1.00.

Monthly by Carrier:

MORNING, EVENING, AND SUNDAY, Fifty cents.

MORNING AND SUNDAY, Thirty-five cents.

EVENING AND SUNDAY, Thirty-five cents.

THE TIMES COMPANY.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Circulation Statement.

The circulation of The Times for the week

ended August 10, 1901, as follows:

Sunday, August 10, 1901, 18,730.

Monday, August 11, 1901, 20,185.

Tuesday, August 12, 1901, 20,185.

Wednesday, August 13, 1901, 20,185.

Thursday, August 14, 1901, 20,185.

Friday, August 15, 1901, 20,185.

Saturday, August 16, 1901, 20,185.

Total, 125,000.

Daily average (Sunday, 18,730, excepted), 20,185.

The Right to Destroy Prosperity.

During the past forty-eight hours,

two men of national standing and

reputation have expressed opinions regard-

ing the great steel strike that will at-

tract widespread attention. We refer

to Monsignor Ireland, Roman Catholic

Archbishop of St. Paul, and Representa-

tive Livingston of Georgia, a member

of the Industrial Commission.

Within a few days a report has been

circulated to the effect that Arch-

bishop Ireland was endeavoring to en-

act the role of mediator between the

Steel Trust and the strikers. Yester-

day he declared that he neither had

been asked by anyone to accept such

a mission, nor would he do so if invited.

Concerning the strike at large, among

other things, he said:

"While the right to enter upon a strike is

and must be considered as a right belonging

to the personal freedom of the citizen, it

must ever be remembered that in the name

of the same principle of personal freedom

from which we claim the right to strike,

we must also claim the right to work

in peace and in the full enjoyment of the

liberty of others who wish to work. The

personal freedom of the individual citizen is

not a license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to strike

is not a license to him to interfere with

the freedom of others. The right to

work is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

freedom of others. The right to work

is not a license to him to interfere

with the freedom of others. The right

to strike is not a license to him to

interfere with the freedom of others.

The right to work is not a license to

him to interfere with the freedom of

others. The right to strike is not a

license to him to interfere with the

controversy to ponder the remarks of

Perkins, the Livingston of Georgia

on the situation. In an interview yester-

day he is quoted as saying:

"The people of this country can hardly realize

the intense feeling which exists between the

representative of capital, on the one side, and

the representative of labor, on the other, as things

are going now. It will require prompt methods by

the Government and extremely delicate handling

of the subject to prevent a revolutionary

conflict between capital and labor. So desperate

are some of the conflicting forces that, suffer-

ing destruction of property, and even bloodshed

cannot be averted, unless a strong hand inter-

fere to prevent these constant disturbances of

the peace of the country."

"This state of affairs cannot go on much

longer without serious consequences. The

feeling is so strong and the feeling so intense

that, without being alarmed, I believe a conflict

between capital and labor can only be averted

by the prompt action, conservative and at the

same time positive interference by the National

Government. The feeling of the trade and

the labor organizations should not be permitted

to have full sway and jeopardize the interests of

the country. It is interested in either of these warring

combinations. The middleman—that is, the man

who is in the middle—must be the principal sufferer

in the case of strife between capital and labor.

The middleman is the man who is in the middle

of the war of the trusts, in all justice and fairness

and in the interest of good government, they

should be protected by the law of the land and

the law of the country."

How long is it supposable that more

than seventy-five million people will

tolerate a devastating economic war be-

tween a billion dollars on one side and

a labor organization of perhaps one

hundred thousand men on the other,

when that war is found to disturb

wages and "business conditions" dis-

tastefully, and to threaten prosperity and

livelihood from end to end of the country?

Neither party to the contest will

be permitted to continue the wrecking

for very long, or we are greatly mis-

taken. Somewhere, authority will be

found to call a halt, and means to make

the call effective. There will be war on

Monday, no doubt, and, perhaps violent

hostilities following; but, later, there

will be intervention, and should there

be riot and bloodshed, it is liable to

come quickly.

The "Censure" of Evans.

Inasmuch as Rear Admiral Evans

was at the Navy Department the other

day, and in friendly consultation with

his friends Hackett and Crowninshield,

it is hardly to be presumed that the

"censure" which he has received for

the attacks upon ex-Secretary Chan-

dler, contained in his book, "A Sailor's

Log," has surprised him. On the con-

trary, it is considered in naval circles

as a very clever piece of composite work

the probable result of which will be to

satisfy the public that the Department

is sincere in condemning his infraction

of propriety and professional ethics,

and, at the same time, to prevent a

demand for a court-martial, which it

might be difficult for Secretary Long

to resist.

In effect the "censure" lets Rear Ad-

miral Evans down easy, and will not in

the remotest degree affect his standing

at the department. Sampson's approval

of the Macley scurrility has not hurt

him any. He stands as well today as

Egan does at the Adjutant General's

Office.

We are not in the confidence of the

Hon. William E. Chandler, and do not

know how the Department disposition of

the Evans matter may appeal to him.

It is possible that he may consider the

Hackett treatment as hardly heroic

enough for the disease. In that event

he still may think it worth while to

take the case before Congress, where

he has many friends among his former

colleagues. On the other hand, it may

occur to him that Mr. McKinley might

not think it grateful on his part to stir

up another scandal in the navy, when

the Spanish claims fatted calf has

been killed for him, and it will take

him the remainder of his life to eat the

last of its chops. So, possibly, he may

stay his vengeful hand, and buy extra

copies of the "Log" that hit him.

Mr. Roberts on Gold Production.

The writings, official and otherwise,

of United States Mint Director George

F. Roberts, clearly show that he has a

strong and comprehensive knowledge

of the foundation principles of mon-

etary science. No other official of the

present Administration has discussed

the subject so exhaustively or so well.

There is nothing strange in this, for his

position calls for a thorough grasp of

the subject, and it is generally under-

stood that his appointment as Mint

Director was in recognition of the abili-

ties with which he combined the free

silver coinage idea in 1895-6. It is, how-

ever, more remarkable that a man who

understands the subject so well, and

who entertains the views which Mr.

Roberts so ably expresses, should have

been one of the most effective cham-

pions of the gold standard in the great

monetary struggle of 1896. The truth

is that Mr. Roberts' statements of fact

and arguments based thereon are ut-

terly antagonistic to the claims and

contentions upon which the champion-

ship of the gold standard has been

based.

If Mr. Roberts' article in the August

number of the "North American Re-

view" had appeared under the signature

of Senator John P. Jones, Gen. A. J.

Warner, or the Hon. Charles A. Towne,